INTRODUCTION – ALIENS AND THE ENGLISH IN LONDON

Tens of thousands of Continental migrants passed in and out of London and other major English towns during the reign of Elizabeth (1558–1603). The merchants of London were used to seeing aliens in their midst, Germans and Italians in particular being a significant presence since the twelfth century. But wars and military occupation in sixteenth-century northern Europe changed the complexion of the immigrant body in England. Protestants migrated in waves after the 1567 news of Alva’s troop deployment to the Netherlands and after the fall of Antwerp in 1585, and a number of French Protestants made their way to England after the Paris Massacre of 1572. Edward VI had established French and Dutch churches in London in 1550, when the resident alien population of England was at its peak, and these institutions continued to act as religious, social, and organizational community centres for the immigrant population throughout the century. Among the religious refugees, however, were economic migrants, and this mixed group caused significant tension in the capital. On the one hand, the new residents brought new skills and stature to English production and trade. On the other hand, they were seen to be economically and ideologically dangerous: they clustered and traded among themselves, sent money abroad instead of reinvesting it in England, and practised religion that was influenced by extremists and attracted good members away from the Church of England.

Resentment against the aliens caused friction between English classes. Landlords benefited from the new immigrants as renters of cheap accommodation, while apprentices and journeymen saw aliens as stealers of jobs from the English. Reformed Christian immigrants were transnational ‘brothers’ against the Catholic beast, but the problem of extreme Protestantism from the Continent continued to trouble the queen.
Moreover, the question of rights to work in the city of London was a constant point of debate between the mayor, the guilds, and the Privy Council. All these groups were similarly concerned about the size and impact of the alien population, and the Crown maintained a policy of dispersal, planting immigrants in provincial towns to spread both the wealth and the worry of the new communities. With perhaps 50,000 Continental aliens coming into England during Elizabeth’s reign and living in clustered – and therefore visible – communities, it was not surprising if a perception of an ‘alien invasion’ was in the air. But placed in the context of the general rise of English and ‘British’ residents in London, the contemporary censuses (the Returns of Strangers) show a proportional decrease in the Continental alien presence in the latter half of the century: from 12.5 per cent in 1553, to 10 per cent in 1571, falling to between 5 and 6 per cent in 1593. Indeed, Elizabethan London’s population was growing at an extraordinary rate, a phenomenon underpinned by migration from within the ‘British Isles’. In the year 1600, London was over sixteen times larger than Norwich, the next most populous English town; fifty years later, it would be second only to Paris in European city population. Frustrations about overcrowding and economic strain led to urban unrest, and the strangers ‘provided a convenient scapegoat’ for expressing that frustration in sometimes violent ways.

While the usage is not perfectly consistent, Elizabethan documents widely employed the terms ‘alien’ and ‘stranger’ to refer to persons from a foreign country. The home ‘country’ in the second half of the sixteenth century is England plus the Principality of Wales. The Scots and the Irish are, therefore, ‘aliens’ along with the Continental European strangers. The term ‘foreigner’ referred to persons from outside the city or region being discussed or those who were not ‘freemen’ of the city (belonging to a guild, allowed to keep an open retail shop, possessing voting and civic representation rights). Continental aliens were usually ‘foreigners’ too, then, in so far as they rarely gained the freedom of the city and became ‘citizens’. In practice, freemen Londoners might cast themselves specifically within what the character Pleasure in Robert Wilson’s *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* calls a ‘race’ of London. That would set them against the provinces, such that while “Foreign” English, needless to say, had separate interests from continental strangers, they were ‘often lumped together with them by citizens’ of London as general outsiders. On the occasions I use ‘foreigner’ in this book, I generally do so in the modern sense of the term, synonymously with ‘alien’ and ‘stranger’; I make it clear when I am talking specifically of the early modern sense of a foreigner.
In between the status of a ‘true born’ English man or woman and an alien was a denizen, a permanent resident with rights of residency and work in the adopted country. Denizens achieved their status through letters petitioned from the Crown. The exact privileges of any denizen were individually laid out in the letter, and it was a status that began with the date of the letter and was not inherited by the children of the alien.¹¹ In a state of limbo throughout the period were those whom we might consider English subjects (i.e. born to English parents) but born abroad (again, including in Scotland and Ireland) or born in England to one or two alien parents. Parliamentary debate and court cases through the reign of James I argued the national status of such persons, and the drama provides several examples of equivocally identified alien residents.¹² Aliens could also petition and pay for an Act of Parliament for naturalization, but very few took this expensive route. In fact, a surprisingly small number of aliens seem to have taken the option of the relatively inexpensive denizenship. Even before one of the primary benefits of denizenship – the right to apprentice an alien son with an English master – was removed by an Act of Common Council in 1574, the proportion of aliens taking denization was fairly low. There was also a very significant drop-off in letters of denization issued later in Elizabeth’s reign: from 1,669 in the period 1558–78 to 293 in 1578–1603. Only 1 per cent of the alien population in 1593 had free denizen status.¹³ This may indicate a loosening of the official attitude towards alien and native commercial contact as the alien communities became assimilated, such that aliens no longer needed letters to practise their trades with English men. It may also indicate the opposite: aliens could have become more introspective and dealt more within their own communities. There may also have been a decreasing commitment to permanent settlement, for aliens who could not be sure they would remain in England for long probably did not feel a strong need for denization.

**A L I E N  S T A G E S  A N D  A L I E N  C O N F U S I O N**

This book studies the ways in which English drama in the second half of the sixteenth century responded to and represented the increasingly diverse and increasingly fraught contact between alien and English men and women in London and England. From this context, I theorize the ways in which certain plays create a notion of ‘Englishness’ that early modern London audiences might – for better or for worse – recognize and approve of. In the preceding section, I outlined early modern...
categorizations of national and local identity. Below, I introduce my own terminology for the present study, and as I do so I remain aware that retrospective labelling of a period or culture can make or impose categories as well as describe them. Therefore, I base my readings of Elizabethan drama in the contexts, signs, and events of the period. At the same time, I am interested in testing the effectiveness of stepping back into our own time to use hindsight and modern theoretical and political tools to assess the desires and anxieties and hopes, the proofs and arguments and gaps in Elizabethan English understandings of regional, national, and international relations.

This section’s title phrase, ‘alien stages’, indicates this book’s concern with several aspects of the working of the Elizabethan stage. First, rather simply, I am studying plays in which physical representations of contemporary and recognizable aliens appear on the stage. Second, where the English stage shows a play set primarily in England but featuring alien characters, it becomes an alien stage as representations of non-Englishness essentially determine dramatic ‘readings’ of London, England, ‘British’ history, and communal identities. And third, there were two broad steps or stages in the dramatic representation of the alien in Elizabethan England.

In the first ‘alien stage’ (primarily but not exclusively in the Marian and earlier Elizabethan drama), English–alien contact is represented as causing infection, ‘deformation’, or corruption by the presence of real alien bodies and influences. These earlier plays appear to do what they can to dismiss or eliminate alien elements (characters, habits, professions, clothing, language). They set up Englishness against otherness by homogenizing the varieties of alien identity (thus all foreigners are equally ‘other’; thus all ‘others’ are diseased, corrupt, etc.). To highlight distasteful foreign elements and make of them a common denominator against which to define Englishness is the process of national-identity-building outlined by much current criticism, and I discuss this trend below.

The second ‘alien stage’ is suggested and tested in late morality plays, but is only clearly manifested in the late-Elizabethan drama. In this latter stage, the plays demonstrate that the absorption of what was deemed utterly ‘alien’ in earlier drama is not just acceptable, but also necessary, for the rise and maintenance of what the plays set forth as a stable, strong English protagonist. ‘Englishness’ in the plays always requires some moral grounding that asserts its superiority to other cultures (and in Elizabethan plays specifically un-Reformed cultures), and it requires physical prowess
demonstrated by strength of mind (standing one’s ground in the face of adversity) and strength of body (successful judgement against evil, usurpation of positions of power, comic trickery) to secure solutions to intractable problems. ‘Englishness’ in these later cases combines itself with the alien and (generally rhetorically) extracts out of that fusion a reformed, expanded, revitalized, and always politically equivocal definition of the English self. As we will see throughout the book, the very status of ‘Englishness’ as a phenomenon with an existence prior to alien contact is continually undermined.

The working of the second alien stage is hardly straightforward, as it argues for an Englishness that is not set against the alien but rather relies on the presence of that other within itself. I contend that this notion of an Englishness that incorporates the alien in all aspects of its representation would not have been too surprising to Elizabethan writers or thinkers. In his Italian–English primer, *First Fruits* (1578), John Florio has his Englishman ask an Italian what he thinks of the English language. The Italian replies:

Certis if you wyl beleve me, it doth not like me at al, because it is a language confused, bepeesed with many tongues: it taketh many words of the latine, & mo from the French, & mo from the Italian, & many mo from the Duitche, some also from the Greeke, & from the Britaine, so that if every language had his owne wordes againe, there woulde but a fewe remaine for English men, and yet every day they adde.

[...]

Make the experience of it, take a booke and reade, but marke well, and you shall not reade four woordes together of true English.44

This sense of the English language as a hodge-podge of tongues was asserted by several writers in the period. Language becomes a vital concern in most of the plays that I discuss in this book, because use and avoidance of language is seen to reveal the will of characters to be incorporated into various communal bodies. I have introduced the ‘mongrel’ English language issue here as a symptomatic synecdoche for the state of Englishness as a whole. For what is interesting in this passage is the use of the word ‘confused’ to describe English a few lines before the concluding notion that there is such a thing as ‘true English’. We are thus presented with the two basic nuances of the word *confuse*: a sense of uncertainty and disorientation on the one hand, and the process of ‘con-fusing’ or coming-together to form a single entity on the other. The end of the passage attempts to keep an alien–English division to stave off
the fear of confused uncertainty in a mixed-up language. Yet such exclusivity of identity is already made equivocal by the passage’s acknowledgement that ‘confusion’ in the second, literal sense lies behind the very construction of Englishness.

The passage from Florio briefly lays out the perspective of the two alien stages by keeping them both in suspension: as in the first alien stage, the speaker attempts to retain an oppositional hypothesis that the alien somehow comes along after the creation of an entire language of ‘pure English’ and invades it; however, as acknowledged in the second alien stage, the speaker has already outlined a process in which English is ‘bepeesed’, put together with foreign tongues – the alien is within English as it is being formed. The Italian speaker also notes that English ‘is a language that wyl do you good in England, but passe Dover, it is woorthing nothing’, suggesting the confusing paradox of a language made up of all the tongues from past Dover, but which is useless once outside the confines of the English borders. Englishness is an identity that only exists by containing the alien, yet it is an identity separate from other national identities.

In the second alien stage, and in the drama of the last decade of Elizabeth’s reign, the search for a settled and ameliorating sense of Englishness will no longer permit simplistic tar-brushing of the alien; each alien element must instead be recognized as already involved in – confused with – English society or culture. As with the language that only develops into a full system by absorbing (pre-existing) alien words, the plays show the alien being absorbed and fused with the native self as that native forms and claims an ‘Englishness’. The fact that such Englishness is most fully laid out by morality vices (with, as we shall see, alien origins), a Welsh king of England, and daughters of a Portuguese father in Englishmen for My Money lets us know that the question of origins remains at stake through the Elizabethan period, and remains unanswered. At any point a culture can look back and talk about previous incarnations of native identity, but from any point that identity can be seen as constructed from alien incorporation. This book will not resolve the question of the English chicken and the alien egg.

The second alien stage, then, gives us something beyond the traditional view of identity determined by its difference from the other: Englishness as an ideology of power built, paradoxically, around the alien that is within it, ‘con-fused’. The process of alien incorporation between the first and the second alien stages is a political and rhetorical move as much as it is a representation of cosmopolitan awareness on the part of English
writers and audiences, because any ‘openness’ to the other is necessarily also a co-option of the other. To deny the alien through a prejudicial or ignorant confusion and rejection, as in the first stage, is to leave Englishness always naïve and open to surprise, attack, and deformation by alien bodies and ideas. To incorporate the alien within Englishness by productive confusion, as in the second stage, is to hybridize and strengthen Englishness for its long-term imperial presence in wider British, European, and worldwide contexts.

The drama’s rhetorical constructions of and rehearsals of versions of ‘English identity’ embed belief in the concept’s reality. If the steady intake of alien elements – foreign bodies – promotes representations of an Englishness vaccinated against ‘impurity’ from the outside, it should be made clear early on that such an idea of exclusive identity is a fiction. The alien remains as a slightly uncomfortable joke or as ancestry to be suppressed and recast. Here, that other rather Miltonic sense of ‘confuse’ as the confounding (confundere) of the rebel angels comes into play, whereby determination to be oneself, to be true to one’s not-lost identity, in spite of adversity, is itself delusional – but powerfully so. Ideologies of identity do not lose their status as having material existence within societies just because their truth factor is compromised. Thus the plays can produce identity separately from politico-historical impositions of geographical and religious identity. I should close this section with the note that the plays engage with the two alien stages as a matter of degree rather than exclusively – one play’s anxiety and rejection of the alien may overshadow a subtle awareness of the alien’s potential usefulness; another play may be very interested in celebrating the alien in England and Englishness while retaining some basic prejudices against the ‘other’.

‘THE STAGE IS ENGLAND’: CRITICAL AND DRAMATIC POSITIONS ON NATIONAL IDENTITY

Much of the critical examination of representations of English identity has remained a study of the first alien stage. We have consistently been told in cultural and literary studies of English national identity that self-identity is determined by its reaction to the other, and specifically its insistence on its difference from the other. The attraction of an antagonistic, oppositional theory of national identity formation has produced many exciting studies of exotic English–alien contact in plays set abroad, which engage forcefully with the early modern matrix of religion, ethnicity, sexuality, and commerce. Since these plays are usually travel or
historical plays featuring merchants, pirates, renegades, and soldiers, the premise of Anglo-alien opposition is reasonable. But in British studies, too, we are told that ‘nationality can only be imagined as a dimension of difference’ from the outside world; ‘England is always discovered elsewhere, defined by the encounter with the Other’ (frequently for these critics, the Irish ‘other’); ‘Englishness and English nationality have been historically defined against non-Englishness’; ‘Englishness’ at this point in time is fiercely determined by a demonisation of all that is not English’; and ‘not-Welshness, not-Scottishness, and certainly not-Frenchness [and] not-Spanishness … gave the English their surest sense of national identity’.

One problem with these statements is that they seem to claim to know what Englishness is. I have been frequently using ‘scare quotes’ for the term Englishness so far to indicate the fact that ‘Englishness’ is not a stable concept, but one that is worked out and defined time and again in different plays and decades. Another problem is that the statements seem to place ‘Englishness’ only within a ‘nation’ of England that feels a sense of ‘national identity’, and they seem to assert that there is no ‘Englishness’ outside of England.

In his examinations of English nationhood, Richard Helgerson takes the investigation of the English search for a stable identity in a different direction. He has provided an alternative way to think of the production of a ‘colonial’ English self, one that brings the view closer to home in geographical terms but pushes it further away in time. He emphasizes the irony of Elizabethan writers’ obligation to and desire for another set of others – the ancient colonizing Romans. The late sixteenth-century call for English rediscovery of their poetic genius did not strive for a new and different mode of expression but for a reliance on foreign examples, he argues: ‘Likeness, not difference, will be the measure of success.’ Thus the alien invaders and their cultural legacy are indeed acknowledged as incorporated into Englishness, but this ‘likeness’ produces a new identity that is specifically ‘English’ (those Romans are gone) and therefore still set in opposition to contemporary alien bodies and cultures – this doubleness echoes John Florio’s Italian speaker’s representation of the English language. Other scholars, such as Jodi Mikalachki, have also concentrated on the need for the English to understand themselves through classical comparison. She writes of the English ‘longing on the one hand to establish historical precedent and continuity, and an equally powerful drive on the other to exorcise primitive savagery from national history and identity. The tensions between these two imperatives inform virtually all articulations of the nation in this period.’ This book agrees.
that the English are striving for stability as they search for national identity’s ‘precedent and continuity’, but it updates the notion in so far as the ‘savagery’ of the modern men and women in the plays set in contemporary England only bears a trace of the ‘primitive’. The alien tendencies are just as often newfangled abhorrences as they are ancient monstrosities (although bad alien habits – for example taking tobacco – often have earlier ‘primitive’ lives).

Two broad points of view dominate studies of English national identity, then: one in which English identity is formed by a centrifugal, colonial activity that uses the other in foreign lands against which to define itself; the second in which the centripetal colonial activity of the distant past haunts and to some extent constrains a creation of English national identity. In contrast to these positions, *Aliens and Englishness* is concerned with an important body of sixteenth-century drama that works out Englishness by dealing not with exotic or ancient others but with European aliens of the present and relatively recent past; not by resistance and antithesis alone but by absorption and similitude; not with ‘elsewhere’ as a location of non-Englishness but with the here and often the now of England (and the expanded ‘England’ of Britain). *Aliens and Englishness* sees Elizabethans’ reflections on English identity as increasingly a process of finding and absorbing alien aspects around them and less the simple phenomenon of frictionally and uncooperatively rubbing up ‘against non-Englishness’. Therefore, the dramatic selection for study in this book has been guided by those plays that are set primarily in England and deal with relatively modern (i.e. not ancient) English, British, and European characters. The religious questions in *Aliens and Englishness* concern the Catholic military and ideological threat, the acceptability of immigrants’ radically reformed Protestantism, the strength of supra-national fellowship with Continental Protestants, and the real or imagined presence of Jews and ‘Jewishness’. The ethnic and ‘racial’ questions are those of cultural traditions and ‘difference’ between European and British neighbours. In the plays this involves aliens who were significantly visible in London and a few major towns – mostly the Dutch, French and French-speaking Lowlanders (Walloon), Welsh, and also to some extent the Italians and Iberians. Questions of sexuality carry over from moral drama’s overt preaching to reprise in the later Elizabethan drama as a set of reformed Christian imperatives in new, urban, mimetic contexts. Finally, the economic questions concern urban artisans and merchants and their ability to live in London and the larger provincial towns, which they felt were increasingly populated by aliens.
By studying the ways in which the plays work through perceptions of the subtle shifts in Anglo-European social and political alignment, we follow dramatic representations and creations of Englishness that were, I suggest, more ‘real’, present, and ‘closer to home’ to the Elizabethan playgoers; more essential to an English understanding of London; and more finely tuned to that audience’s immediate concerns than the assertions of self and other, native and alien, ‘barbarous’ and ‘civilized’ that we find in literary representations of exotic Anglo-American, Anglo-Mediterranean, or Anglo-Eastern contact. While ethnic ‘others’ have been treated very seriously in literary criticism of the past thirty years, the white male and female alien to Englishness have received more attention from historians’ studies of migration and labour patterns and less attention from literary scholars interested in how alien figures are represented and used in imaginative and ideological ways.

The main study texts in this book are plays set in England, and these productions force a focus on what the Elizabethan dramatists decided to represent about the incoming alien, rather than how English self-perception was challenged and changed by external alien encounters. So, while a large proportion of the English were no doubt fascinated by images and narratives of and about the New World, Africa, and Asia – and Henslowe’s diary shows that this was a large part of his theatre’s repertoire – such texts did not extend to fantasies of an England peopled by Americans or Africans. (This is of course in spite of such historical phenomena as the presence of a small but noticeable black community in late-Elizabethan and Jacobean London, revealed to us through expulsion orders.) Caliban is not in Elizabethan drama, nor is he in England for an extended period of time – although Trinculo reminds us a decade after this study leaves off that he could have been. Literary and narrative representation of these ethnic groups probably helped prompt ideologically self-centred confirmations of national and personal superiority on the part of the English, but exotic foreigners either remain distant and among other foreigners, or they are catalysts, enhancing certain interactions between English citizens and British or European others. With this domestic dynamic in mind, we should take seriously the literal suggestiveness of the scene-setting in the list of ‘The Actors Names’ in Grim the Collier of Croydon, possibly by William Haughton, where we read that ‘The Stage is England’. Instead of the more benign ‘The scene is England’, the statement suggests a stage that not only works with ‘Englishness’ in some ways, but is compulsory viewing in order to know England. This interestingly alters and arguably compounds Thomas